

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,855	03/22/2006	Munekatsu Shimada	072280-0013	9266
	7590 03/16/2010 F WILL & EMERY LL	EXAMINER		
600 13TH STR		KIM, JOHN K		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005-3096		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2834	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/16/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/572,855	SHIMADA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JOHN K. KIM	2834		

	JOHN K. KIM	2834						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 24 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.						
I The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin	d date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07		00/->						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be t	filed within two months	of the date of					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
 ∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ∑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 								
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: see Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).							
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)								
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•						
7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	cplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	it before or on the date of filing a No	tice of Appeal will not	be entered					
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	•		•					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:								
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:								
JK	/Quyen Leung/ SPE, Art Unit 2834							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed claim 1 amendment adding "formed across an inner wall thereof" such that "a bridge side on an inner circumference of a magnet insention window of said rotor having a layer which is formed across an inner wall thereof" and "a laser peening of irradiating at an angle relative to the inner wall of the bridge side" appear to raise new issues requiring further search and/or consideration. In any case, it is noted that the claimed structure resulting from the added product-by-process steps does not appear to be structurally different from the structure of the applied prior art.